



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MEGILLAT TAANIT AS A SOURCE FOR JEWISH CHRONOLOGY AND HISTORY IN THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN PERIODS

BY SOLOMON ZEITLIN, Dropsie College.

CHAPTER IV

CONTENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MACCABEES I AND 2.

BESIDES the seeming chronological differences between 1 and 2 Maccabees which we have reconciled above there exist also chronographical divergences between the two books which have to be cleared up before the data in the Megillat Taanit, which refer to Maccabean events, can be properly fixed and dated. The following outline will reveal the crucial points of difference between the two books. 2 Maccabees generally narrates events undated, and we place them parallel to the column where they are described with dates in 1 Maccabees.

1 Maccabees.	2 Maccabees.
A. S.	
143 Antiochus on his return from Egypt captures Je- rusalem (1. 20-24).	
145 (Two years later) he again captures and kills many Jews (1. 29-35). On 15th of Kislev he builds next to the altar 'the abomi- nation of desolation'. On	Antiochus in his second march from Egypt cap- tures Jerusalem, takes silver from the Sanctuary (5. 1-27); soon after, he orders the statue of
VOL. X.	E

- the 25th day they sacrifice offerings on the newly-built altar (1. 59). Zeus to be set up (6. 1-3).
- 146 Mattathias dies (2. 70). Judas's victories over Apollonius and Seron (3. 10-25).
- 147 Antiochus crosses the Euphrates on his way to Persia (3. 37). Before setting out for Persia he orders Lysias to make a campaign against Judas (3. 32-5). Lysias delegates Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias to conduct the campaign against Judas (3. 38). Judas's victories over them (4. 14-25). Judas's victories over Nicanor and Gorgias. Judas comes to Jerusalem (8. 8-31).
- Antiochus IV dies (9. 1-28).
- 148 In the next year Lysias marches to the south of Judea (4. 28). Judas comes to Jerusalem. The Temple is cleansed; the Jews offer sacrifices on the altar (4. 36-61). War of Jews with neighbouring nations (5. 1-8). The Jews cleanse the Temple and sacrifice on the altar (10. 1-5). Antiochus V becomes king (10. 9, 11). Wars of Jews with neighbouring countries (10. 15).

- 149 Antiochus IV dies (6. 1-16). Accession of Antiochus Eupator (6. 17). Judas attacks the citadel of Jerusalem (6. 18-19). Lysias's expedition and treaty (11). Lysias and Antiochus send letters of peace to the Jews (17-38). More about wars with neighbouring nations (12. 1-45).
- 150 Lysias's second expedition; peace with Jews (6. 28-54). 149 Second expedition of Lysias and Antiochus V; peace made with Jews (13. 1-26).
- 151 Accession of Demetrius I (7. 1-4). Alcimus becomes high-priest (7. 15-22). Nicanor is killed, 13th Adar (7. 1-50). Accession of Demetrius I (14. 1-2). Alcimus becomes high-priest (14. 3). Nicanor is killed, 13th Adar (15. 28-36).

As may be seen from this list, there exists not only a chronological discrepancy between these two books, but also differences with regard to the events themselves. Thus, according to 1 Maccabees, the purifying of the sanctuary took place before the death of Antiochus IV, while according to 2 Maccabees it took place after his death. According to 1 Maccabees, furthermore, Lysias's expedition followed in the second year after the victory of Judas over Nicanor and Gorgias, while according to 2 Maccabees it took place after the purification of the

Temple in the days of Antiochus V. It should also be noted that in 2 Maccabees reference is made to letters which Antiochus sent to the Jews, which find no mention in 1 Maccabees. Nevertheless, it seems to me that not only are the seeming chronological contradictions reconcilable according to the theory explained above, but these differences in narration too may be satisfactorily explained. As will be shown presently, the two accounts often supplement each other, since they are based on independent sources, and the apparent differences in the two narratives are due to the loose composition of 2 Maccabees, where a number of passages have been dislocated. In the following outline I shall reconstruct the historical order of the events narrated in Maccabees which will also make clear the relation between the two sources.

We know from 1 Macc. (1. 20-4) that in the year 143 A.S. (171-170 B.C.E.) Antiochus returned from his war with Egypt, and captured Jerusalem. This took place about the close of the summer 170 B.C.E.⁷³ According to the same source, Jerusalem was again captured by the forces of Antiochus IV two years later (1. 29). It is this event and not the first capture of Jerusalem with which 2 Maccabees opens. Thus the capture of Jerusalem in this source is properly connected with Antiochus's return from the second war with Egypt which took place 169-168,⁷⁴ and therefore

⁷³ Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, III, pp. 318-20. For renewal of the war between Antiochus IV and the Egyptians in the year 171/70 see Hitzig, *Das Buch Daniel*, p. 205; Wilcken in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Enc.*, II, 2470-6. See above, note 34.

⁷⁴ Antiochus IV was in Egypt in 169 (see above, note 35); comp. Polyb., XXVIII, 17 and XXIX, 23-6; Niese, *Geschichte*, III, pp. 174, 230-1, and 'Die beiden Makkabäerbücher', *Hermes*, XXV (1900), pp. 502-5; Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, II, p. 172; G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, II, 1908. See above, note 35.

corresponds correctly with the date assigned for the second capture of Jerusalem in 1 Maccabees, 145 A.S. Following 1 Maccabees we learn that the erection of the statue of Zeus in the Temple was carried out in Kislev 145 A.S. This date is inherently impossible, because, according to the same source, the capture of Jerusalem took place in the summer of 145 A.S.—168 B.C.E. Consequently the erection of the statue of Zeus in Kislev must refer to Kislev 146 in the autumn of the 168 B.C.E. This emendation is corroborated by 2 Maccabees, where it is stated clearly that some time elapsed between the capture of Jerusalem and the placing of Zeus in the Temple (μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον).⁷⁵

⁷⁵ We are quite safe in emending 145–146. The error crept in through the fact that earlier in the chapter it is stated that after two years, i.e. two years after 143, Antiochus came and captured Jerusalem. This was in the year 145, being, as we said above, in the summer of 168 B.C. Now some scribe thought that the setting up of the image next to the altar belonged to the two years whereof the author of 1 Maccabees speaks. Consequently it must have been in the year 145. But according to 2 Maccabees, there elapsed considerable time between Antiochus's capture of Jerusalem and his edict to set up the statue of Zeus in the Temple, μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον. (According to 2 Maccabees it was Apollyon who set up the image. See Niese, *Geschichte*, III, p. 233 and note), and this should be three years before the cleansing of the Temple, so that the cleansing of the Temple took place in the month of Kislev, 165, and therefore the setting up of the image took place in Kislev, 168, which is the earlier part of 146 A.S. This number 145 does not belong here at all; it fits in the verse 29, where we read 'two years later', i.e. 145. In this passage disorder prevails, for whereas our text has 'on the fifteenth of Kislev', the Syriac version of Maccabees in Codex Ambrosianus reads 'on the twenty-fifth of Kislev', which is certainly correct. Furthermore, the number 145 is represented in the Codex Alexandrinus by 45. All this goes to show that the scribe was confused, and that the passage cannot be accepted in its present state, but it is necessary to consider carefully its chronologic aspects and revise it. It is interesting to note that Kautzsch (*Apokrypha*, 1 Mak. 1. 54) puts the number 145 in parenthesis: apparently he is not convinced that it belonged to this verse.

In the narrative of 1 Maccabees the revolt of Mattathias is now described, and his death is dated 146 (168–167 B. C. E.). The victory of Judas over Apollonius and Seron follows; and Antiochus IV, who heard of the defeat of his generals, would have liked in person to proceed to Judea and to humble Judas, but he needed money, and on that account went to Persia with half of his army—the other half being committed to Lysias with the command to quell the insurrection in Judea. Antiochus crossed the Euphrates in 147 (167–166) (3. 37). Lysias, however, did not go in person to fight Judas, but sent Nicanor and Gorgias—evidently in the same year, 147. 2 Maccabees now joins 1 Maccabees in describing Judas's great victory over these generals, though the two accounts show slight variants.

Following again 1 Maccabees we note that in the second year after the expedition of Nicanor and Gorgias Lysias went in person to fight Judas *καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐχόμενῳ ἐνιαυτῷ*, i. e. in the year 148 (166–165). Judas defeats Lysias, enters Jerusalem, and cleanses the Sanctuary in 148 (166–165). There follows a series of wars between the neighbouring nations and finally the death of Antiochus in the year 149 (165–164).

In 2 Maccabees the same events are narrated in a different order. Immediately after Judas's victory over Nicanor follows the account of his wars with the neighbouring nations and the death of Antiochus IV, and then comes the cleansing of the Temple by Judas, the succession of Antiochus Eupator to the throne, more wars with the neighbouring nations, and then finally Lysias's expedition and peace.

This order is incompatible with the same author's account of the historical events to the extent that we are forced to assume that we face here a peculiar dislocation

of parts of the narrative, which may be attributed to the loose manner in which the author condensed the fuller account of Jason of Cyrene. Thus it is obvious that the expedition of Lysias could not have been delayed until after the death of Antiochus IV and after the purification of the Temple and the succession of Antiochus V. According to what we have seen above, Antiochus IV at the very time that he proceeded in person to Persia in 167-166 ordered Lysias to take measures to suppress the revolt in Judea. In accordance with these instructions Lysias, as we have seen, deputed Nicanor and Gorgias, who were repulsed by Judas evidently in the same year 166. Now it is certainly inconceivable that Lysias would delay all efforts to suppress the revolt for an interval of two years, which is implied in the present account of Maccabees, and meanwhile give the Judeans the opportunity to unite their forces, and fortify themselves more strongly against Syria. Furthermore, if this expedition belonged to the period of Antiochus Eupator, it would be strange that the author fails to mention the name of Antiochus Eupator in this connexion, as he does in recording the second campaign.⁷⁶ The reference to Lysias as being in sole control of his expedition can be only explained by assuming that it took place in the reign of Antiochus IV, while the latter was in Persia.⁷⁷

Finally, and this is most conclusive, the letter of Antiochus V to Lysias ordering him to arrange for peace with Judas announces the recent death of his father Antio-

⁷⁶ Μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον Λύσιας ἐπίτροπος τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ συγγενῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων (2 Macc. 11. 1).

⁷⁷ Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, pp. 178-80 and Appendix J. See also Niese, *Geschichte*, III, p. 219.

chus IV. Furthermore, the preceding letter containing the peace negotiations between Judas and Lysias is definitely dated 148.⁷⁸ Consequently the beginning of the expedition took place in the lifetime of Antiochus IV, according to the very account of 2 Maccabees, while the purification of the Temple and the establishment of peace took place early in the reign of Antiochus V. Undoubtedly Jason's history, which was the source of 2 Maccabees, properly fixed the beginning of Lysias's expedition in the reign of Antiochus IV, and the end in that of Antiochus V. The author of 2 Maccabees, copying the account, misplaced the beginning of the expedition in the reign of Antiochus V, where he really found the end of the expedition recorded.

Thus reconstructed, the account of 2 Maccabees corrects the narrative of 1 Maccabees. For according to the latter, the purification of the Temple took place before the death of Antiochus IV. This is impossible, however, because Antiochus IV died early in the autumn of 165,⁷⁹ whereas the cleansing of the Temple did not take place till Kislev 165. In this respect therefore the account of 2 Maccabees is superior to that of 1 Maccabees. This is to be explained by the sources which were used by the two authors. The former was based presumably on the accurate account of Jason; while the latter was written in Palestine where,

⁷⁸ With regard to the letters sent by Antiochus V to the Jews, and also with regard to the embassies sent by Rome to the Jews, see Niese, *Hermes*, pp. 476-90. The first letter is dated 148 A. S. (165/4), and in the month of Dioscorus, on the twenty-fourth thereof. The month Dioscorus is not known to us. Many scholars think this is a Syro-Macedonian month, Dios, and this about corresponds with the Jewish month Heshvan. The Peshitta has, in the place of Dioscorus, 'the Second Tishri', the Second Tishri of the Syrians. See also Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, III, Appendix 4.

⁷⁹ Niese, *l. c.*, pp. 473-6; Bevan, *l. c.*, p. 180 and Appendix J. See above, p. 83 and note 32.

owing to the state of siege, the Jews may not have known of the death of Antiochus IV until after peace was made with Lysias and the Temple had been purified, and this impression is reproduced in 1 Maccabees.⁸⁰

The statement that the purification of the Temple occurred in Kislev 165 seems to be in contradiction to the date of 1 Maccabees according to my theory of this author's reckoning of the Seleucid era. For the date which is assigned for this event in 1 Maccabees is Kislev 148, which according to our calculation corresponds to Kislev 166 B. C. E. But this could not be correct, as Kislev of the year 148 (Sel.) fell in 166 B. C. E. and not in 165 B. C. E. However, it may be safely assumed that the number 148 crept in through error, and is to be emended into 149. Thus the Peshitta Codex Ambrosianus (ed. Ceriani) reads plainly *ܟܝܣܠܝ ܠܟܠ ܫܠܫ ܥܠܫܐ ܫܠܫ ܥܝܪܝܢܐ*, the year one hundred and forty-nine. The error is easily explained on the ground that the scribe calculated the three years which, according to the plain statement of 1 Maccabees, elapsed between the defiling and the rededication of the altar on the basis of what we proved to be the false reading 145 A. S., and naturally attained the result 148.⁸¹

⁸⁰ It is quite possible that the death of Antiochus IV, and the purification of the Temple took place at the same time in the fall of 165 B. C. E.

⁸¹ See above, p. 53, and n. 75. According to 1 Macc. (1. 54) three years elapsed between the defiling and the rededication of the Altar. This is also stated by Josephus, *Ant.* XII, 7. 6, but according to *Bel. Iud.* I, 4 and V, 9. 4, three years and six months passed. The two statements, however, are in agreement; the three years and six months are not from the time of the defiling but from the time when Antiochus captured Jerusalem and desolated the sanctuary in the year of 145 A. S., i. e. in the summer of 168 B. C. (see above, p. 53). Until the rededication of the Temple there was a period of three years and six months. These two statements are fully in agreement, Niese and Reinach notwithstanding.

Attention may here be called to the passage in Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, 7. 6) where the purification and dedication of the Temple is dated 148 A.S., and in addition the Olympiad date 154 is also given. As 154 Olymp. corresponds to July 164–July 160, the dedication of the Temple could not have taken place in Kislev of any other year than 164, which contradicts not only our established date of 165, but is opposed to his own date of 148 A.S. As a result, scholars have not hesitated to emend the reading of 154 Olymp. to 153–4 Olymp.,⁸² while others place the event of Hanukkah in Kislev 164.⁸³

We need not follow, however, either of these two strained conclusions. As Unger⁸⁴ has proved conclusively, there existed two systems of the Olympiad calendar, the Attic and the Macedonian respectively. The former was the original Olympiad calendar, 154 Olymp., corresponding to July 164–July 160. The Macedonian Olympiad calendar, on the other hand, is a modified form of the original Olympiad calendar which was adopted in the Macedonian period, and was adopted by them in accordance with their established system of dating the new year. These peoples being accustomed to date the beginning of their year in the autumn, that is, in the month of Dios (November), they also fixed the new year of their adopted Olympiad calendar according to their traditional custom. Local divergences then ensued. In some localities, the beginning of year I Olymp. was shifted back from July 776 to the autumn 777. This record is pre-

See Niese, *Zur Chronologie des Josephus*, p. 225; see also Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse*, p. 50, n. 2.

⁸² Reinach, *Œuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe*, *Ant.*, XII, 4. 6, p. 109, n. 2. See also Niese, *Zur Chronologie des Josephus*, pp. 224–5.

⁸³ See Bevan, *l. c.*, Appendix J.

⁸⁴ Unger, *Die Seleukidenära der Makkabäerbücher*, chap. V, p. 300.

served in Polybius, as Nissen has already shown.⁸⁵ On the other hand, records of Castor, Phlegon, Julius, Africanus, Porphyrius,⁸⁶ and possibly Eusebius,⁸⁷ show that numerous localities dated October 776 as marking the beginning of year 2 of I Olymp., the fraction of the preceding Olympiad year being reckoned as a full year. (Compare above the similar method which was applied by the Jews to the Seleucid era. In this system therefore 154 Olymp. covers the years October 165–October 161, and the date given by Josephus in this connexion—Olymp. 154–1—really corresponds to Kislev 165 B.C.E. That Josephus was acquainted with this form of the Macedonian-Olympian calendar is clearly shown in his citation of Castor in *Contra Apionem* (I, 22) to the effect that the battle of Gaza was fought in the eleventh year after the death of Alexander, and in 117 Olympiad. Now the eleventh year after the death of Alexander is at the latest June 312 B.C.E.⁸⁸, whereas 117 Olympiad Attic only began July 312! Consequently it must be assumed that in this Olympiad the autumn of 776 marked the beginning of year 2, in which the Olymp. of 117 began in the autumn of 313 B.C.E.

It should be added that in the *Antiquities* Josephus uses the Olympiad nine times, but, owing to the composite nature of his sources, it becomes necessary to identify the calendar in each reference.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Nissen H., *Rhein. Museum*, 1871, p. 242.

⁸⁶ Unger, *l. c.*

⁸⁷ See Unger, *l. c.*; see also Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, III, Beilage II.

⁸⁸ Alexander died May–June 323 B.C.E. Plutarch, *Alexander*, 76; Clinton, *F. H.*, Oxford, II, pp. 176–8. See above.

⁸⁹ (1) *Ant.*, XII, 5, 4; (2) XII, 7, 6; (3) XIII, 8, 2; (4) XIV, 1, 2; (5) XIV, 4, 3; (6) XIV, 14, 5; (7) XIV, 16, 4; (8) XV, 5, 1; (9)

We may now complete our reconstruction of the events occurring in Maccabees and bearing on the Megillat Taanit, as outlined in the diagram. That the peace between the Syrians and the Judeans did not last long is stated in both Maccabean Books. This time Lysias marched with Antiochus Eupator against Judas, in what is described I Macc. (6. 53) as a sabbatical year, i. e. from Tishri 164 to Tishri 163 (see above; see also No. 8). According to both books peace was established in the same year, but this peace was premature, and war broke out again after the accession of Demetrius in 151 A. S. (163-162 B. C. E.). Nicanor was entrusted with the expedition against Judas, and he met his death on 13th Adar. The year of his death is not recorded in either book, but indirectly we may safely infer that it was the year 152 A. S. or 161 B. C. E., as Demetrius received the news of this defeat in the first month (Nisan) of 152 A. S., 161 B. C. E.⁹⁰

XVI, 5. 1. Comp. S. Zeitlin, *When did Jerusalem surrender to Antiochus Sidetes?* Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, vol. XXVI, 1918, pp. 165-71.

⁹⁰ See above, note 27.

CHAPTER V

THE CALENDAR SYSTEM IN *BELLUM IUDAICUM*.

AS in the Maccabees so in the works of Josephus the fundamental problem is to determine the chronology and calendar which Josephus employed in his narratives. We are confronted with the much discussed problem⁹¹ whether in *Bellum Iudaicum* the Syrian names of the months are used to represent the Jewish months, Xanthicus approximately for Nisan, Artemisius for Iyyar, &c., or whether they represent the Julian (Solar) calendar proper, in which case Xanthicus corresponds to April, Artemisius is May, &c.

The following is an outline of the dated events in *Bell. Iud.*⁹²

(1) The war began in the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, and the seventeenth of the reign of Agrippa, in the month Artemisius (II, 14. 4).

(2) On the sixteenth day of the month Artemisius and on the next day riots broke out in Jerusalem (II, 15. 2).

(3) On the fifteenth of the month of Lous an assault was made upon Antonia and the garrison was besieged (II, 17. 7).

⁹¹ See Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, I, 400-2; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 448; Unger, 'Die Tagdata des Josephus' (*Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie, philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl.*, 1893 B., II, pp. 453-92); Schürer, *Geschichte*, I, pp. 755-60.

⁹² This outline was given by Hoffmann, *De imperatoris Titi temporibus recte definiendis*, Marburg, 1883, and by Niese, *Hermes*, 1893, pp. 197-9.

(4) On the sixth day of the month Gorpiaeus the king's palaces were captured (II, 17. 8).

(5) On the thirtieth day of the month Hyperberetaeus Cestius made an assault upon Jerusalem (II, 19. 4).

(6) On the eighth day of the month of Dius, in the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, the defeat of Cestius took place (II, 19. 9).

(7) On the twenty-first day of the month Artemisius, Josephus came from Tiberias, and went into Jotapata (III, 7. 3).

(8) On the twentieth day of the month Daesius, the first assault was made upon Jotapata (III, 7. 29).

(9) On the twenty-fifth day of the month Daesius Japha was captured (III, 7. 31).

(10) On the twenty-seventh day of the month Daesius Gerizim was captured (III, 7. 32).

(11) On the first day of the month Panemus, in the thirteenth year of the reign of Nero, Jotapata was taken by the Romans (III, 7. 36).

(12) On the fourth day of the month Panemus Vespasian returned to Ptolemais (III, 9. 1).

(13) On the eighth day of the month Gorpiaeus the prisoners of Tarichea were taken (III, 10. 10).

(14) On the twenty-second day of the month Hyperberetaeus Gamala fell before the Romans (IV, 1. 9).

(15) On the twenty-third day of the month Hyperberetaeus Gamala was taken, whereas the city had first revolted on the twenty-fourth day of the month Gorpiaeus (IV, 1. 10).

(16) On the fourth day of the month Dystrius Vespasian entered the city of Gadara (IV, 7. 3).

(17) On the second day of the month Daesius Vespasian pitched his camp by the city Coreai (IV, 8. 1).

(18) On the fifth day of the month Daesius Vespasian removed from Caesarea and marched against those places of Judea which had not yet been subdued (IV, 9. 9).

(19) In the month Xanthicus in the third year of the war Simon got possession of Jerusalem (IV, 9. 12).

(20) On the third day of the month Apellaeus Vitellius was killed (IV, 11. 4).

(21) On Passover, the fourteenth day of the month Xanthicus, John took possession of the Temple (V, 3. 1).

(22) On the seventh day of the month Artemisius the Romans took possession of the First Wall (V, 7. 2).

(23) On the twelfth day of the month Artemisius the Romans began to raise their earthworks against Antonia and the Temple (V, 11. 4).

(24) On the twenty-ninth day of the month Artemisius this was completed (*ibid.*).

(25) A vast number of dead bodies were carried out from one gate of Jerusalem from the fourteenth day of the month Xanthicus, to the first day of the month Panemus (V, 13. 7).

(26) On the first day of the month Panemus the Romans were attacked by the Jews (VI, 1. 3).

(27) On the third day of the month Panemus the Romans attempted to take possession of the tower of Antonia (VI, 1. 6).

(28) On the seventeenth day of the month Panemus the daily sacrifice (*ἐνδελεχισμός*) failed (VI, 2. 1).

(29) On the twenty-fourth day of the month Panemus the Romans set fire to the Cloister (VI, 2. 9).

(30) On the twenty-seventh day of the month Panemus the Jews set all the Western Cloisters on fire (VI, 3. 1).

(31) On the eighth day of the month Lous the Romans had completed their earthworks (VI, 4. 1).

(32) On the tenth day of the month Lous the Temple was burned by the Romans (in the second year of the reign of Vespasian) (VI, 4. 5, 8).

(33) On the eighth day of the month Xanthicus, when the people were come to the feast of unleavened bread, signs appeared in Jerusalem. A great light shone round the altar (VI, 5. 3).

(34) On the twenty-first day of the month Artemisius, a few days after the feast, a prodigious and incredible phenomenon appeared (*ibid.*).

(35) On the twentieth day of the month Lous the raising of earthworks against the upper city was begun (VI, 8. 1).

(36) On the seventh day of the month Gorpiaeus the Romans brought their machines against the wall (VI, 8. 4).

(37) On the eighth day of the month Gorpiaeus, in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, Jerusalem was taken by the Romans (VI, 8. 5 ; 10. 1).

(38) On the fifteenth day of the month Xanthicus (in the fourth year of the reign of Vespasian) Masada was taken (VII, 7. 1 ; 9. 1).

Scaliger⁹³ and Usher⁹⁴ maintained that Josephus in his *Bell. Iud.* used the Roman, i.e. the Julian calendar, and that Xanthicus = April and Artemisius = May.⁹⁵ According to this opinion, Titus's burning of the Temple,

⁹³ Joseph Scaliger, *Opus de Emendatione temporum*, lib. I, Genevae, 1629.

⁹⁴ Usher, *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, 1654, vol. ii.

⁹⁵ See further Usher, *l. c.*, and Scaliger, *l. c.*

which Josephus tells us took place on the 10th of Lous, took place on the 10th of August. But since Noris⁹⁶ has shown that in the year 70 C. E. the 10th of Ab could not have fallen on the 10th of August, Clinton⁹⁷ and Ideler⁹⁸ inclined to the view that in *Bell. Iud.* Josephus makes use of the same calendar as in *Antiquities*, i. e. the Jewish Calendar, only substituting Syro-Macedonian names of the months for the Hebrew names, Xanthicus for Nisan, Artemisius for Iyyar, Daesius for Sivan, Lous for Ab, &c. They illustrate this method of translating the calendar from Josephus's fuller explanation in *Antiquities*, where he states that Passover was celebrated in Xanthicus, which the Jews call Nisan, and also with regard to Hanukkah, that they celebrate it in Apellaeus, which the Jews call Kislev.⁹⁹ Thus, too, when in *Bell. Iud.* Josephus states that Titus burned the Temple on the 10th of Lous, on the same month and day of the month whereon the first sanctuary had been destroyed by the Babylonians, it refers to the 10th of Ab and corresponds with the statement of Jeremiah that it took place on the 10th day of the fifth month, i. e. the 10th of Ab.¹⁰⁰ Another proof frequently quoted is Josephus's statement that the Wood-Festival was celebrated on the 14th day of Lous,¹⁰¹ which seems to harmonize with the Mishnah.¹⁰² The Wood-Festival is fixed on the 15th day of Ab. For though there is a difference of one day between Josephus and the Mishnah it is reconciled by assuming that part of the day before a Yom Tob

⁹⁶ Noris, *Annus et Epochæ Syro-Macedonum*, p. 14, Lipsiae, 1696.

⁹⁷ H. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, III, Appendix IV, Oxford, 1895.

⁹⁸ Ideler, *Handbuch*, *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ant.* III, 10. 5; XII, 5. 4 and 7. 6.

¹⁰⁰ Jer. 52. 12.

¹⁰¹ *Bell. Iud.* II, 17. 6.

¹⁰² Mishnah, Taanit, IV, 5. 8.

partakes of the character of Yom Tob,¹⁰³ or by assuming a scribal error in Josephus, where 15 of Lous should be read instead of 14.¹⁰⁴ By similar lines of argument many scholars have supported the view that in *Bell. Iud.* Josephus used the Jewish calendar, merely substituting Syro-Macedonian names of months for the Jewish names.

This view was opposed by O. A. Hoffmann,¹⁰⁵ who maintained that except in a few cases where the interest is purely Jewish, the months are those of the solar year, since Josephus lived in the Roman environment and treated of these matters as part of Roman history. Hence the majority of the months in *Bellum Iudaicum*, as distinct from those given in connexion with the Jewish holidays, are months of the Julian year, though the terminology is Syro-Macedonian. Schlatter¹⁰⁶ is particularly favourable to this view, and adds the further proof that the months in *Bell. Iud.* have 30 and 31 days, which clearly refers to the Julian or solar year, for months of the Jewish year have only 29 and 30 days, never 31.

Niese¹⁰⁷ agrees with Hoffmann that the calendar in *Bell. Iud.*, except where mention is made of Jewish festivals, is not that of the lunar cycle. Niese furthermore proves from *Antiquities* (III, 10. 5) where Josephus writes, 'On the fourteenth day of Xanthicus according to the lunar calendar' (κατὰ σελήνην) that Josephus knew of another Xanthicus according to solar reckoning (κατὰ θεόν).

¹⁰³ Schürer, *Geschichte*, p. 757.

¹⁰⁴ Graetz, III, p. 472; Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 109, n. 2.

¹⁰⁵ Otto A. Hoffmann, *l. c.*, pp. 4-17.

¹⁰⁶ Schlatter, *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas*, 1893, pp. 360-7.

¹⁰⁷ Niese, 'Zur Chronologie des Josephus; Ueber den von Josephus im *Bellum Iudaicum* benutzten Kalender' (*Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), pp. 197-208).

But Niese does not agree with Hoffmann that the months in *Bell. Iud.* are Roman. For if they were Roman months it would be hard to understand why Josephus used the Syro-Macedonian instead of Roman names proper. According to Niese the calendar of *Bell. Iud.* was not Roman, but the Tyrian, which was also a solar cycle and which was generally used in the Diaspora in Josephus's days. Niese¹⁰⁸ in this connexion borrowed Noris's proof that Josephus must have used this calendar when he recorded Vitellius's death as occurring on the third day of Apellaeus; for it is impossible to reconcile this date with Tacitus (*Hist.* III, 79 f.) that Vitellius died on the 20th December, except by assuming that Josephus's date, 3rd of Apellaeus, refers to the Tyrian calendar. For it is only in the Tyrian calendar that the third of Apellaeus falls on the 20th of December (Julian).¹⁰⁹ To the authority of Niese may be added that of Eduard Schwartz, who is one of the few noted scholars who accepted Niese's identification of Josephus's Tyrian calendars.¹¹⁰ The Tyrian calendar is herewith subjoined.

(1) Hyperberetaeus	19th October	30 days
(2) Dios	18th November	30 „
(3) Apellaeus	18th December	30 „
(4) Audynaecus	17th January	30 „

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* See Niese, *l. c.*

¹⁰⁹ This was shown by Noris in his book, *Annus et Epochae* . . . , p. 61 : 'Ibi nomine Apellaei nec suorum popularium Casleu lunarem intelligit, nec ipsum Apellaeum solarem Antiochensium aliarumque in superiori Syria gentium, sed plane designat Apellaeum solarem Tyriorum, qui quidem Tyriorum mensis inibat die XVIII^o Decembris; unde tertia Apellaei cum XX^o eiusdem Decembris concurrebat. . . . Iosephus Apellaeum mensem loca laudato Phoenicum more expressit'.

¹¹⁰ E. Schwartz, 'Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln' (*Abhandl. d. K. Ges. d. Wissenschaft. z. Göttingen*, VII. Bd., 1905, pp. 138-69).

(5) Peritius	16th February	30 days
(6) Dystrus	18th March	31 „
(7) Xanthicus	18th April	31 „
(8) Artemisius	19th May	31 „
(9) Daesius	19th June	31 „
(10) Panemus	20th July	31 „
(11) Lous	20th August	30 „
(12) Gorpiaeus	19th September	30 „ ¹¹¹

In the course of this study it will become clear that only by assuming the Tyrian calendar in the *Bell. Iud.* can the dates of Megillat Taanit be made to agree with the dates of Josephus.¹¹² We shall also prove that even those dates which Niese concedes as referring to the lunar calendar are not to be so construed. For the present, however, we shall content ourselves with disproving the arguments of Ideler which have gained for his view the support of many scholars, and which Niese and Schwartz did not attempt to refute.

Firstly, the *Bell. Iud.* must be dissociated from the *Antiquities*. Unlike the *Bell. Iud.*, the *Antiquities* with few exceptions explicitly equates the Syriac with the Hebrew months as the following table clearly shows :

(1) The Flood began in the second month called by the Macedonians Dius, but by the Hebrews Marḥeshwan ; for so did they order the year in Egypt. But Moses appointed that Nisan, which is the same as Xanthicus, should be the first month for their festivals, because he brought them out of Egypt in that month, so that this month began the year, as to all the solemnities they ob-

¹¹¹ The year of the Tyrians began with the month Hyperberetaeus—October 19th.

¹¹² See below, No. XXI, XXII, XXV, XXVII.

served the original order of the months or to selling and buying, and other ordinary affairs. I, 3. 3; cp. Gen. 7. 11, and Talmud R. ha-Shanah.

(2) God commanded Moses to tell the Hebrews to make ready a sacrifice on the tenth day of the month Xanthicus against the fourteenth; the month is called by the Egyptians Pharmuthi, and by the Hebrews Nisan, but the Macedonians call it Xanthicus. II, 1. 4, 6; cp. Exod. 12. 3-6.

(3) They (the Hebrews) left Egypt in the month Xanthicus, in the fifteenth day according to the moon. II, 15. 2; cp. above, No. 2, and Exod. 12. 1-43.

(4) In the month Xanthicus, as the Macedonians call it, but the Hebrews call it Nisan, on the new moon, they consecrated the Tabernacle. III, 8. 4; cp. Exod. 40. 16.

(5) Concerning the Festivals: The seventh month, which the Macedonians call Hyperberetaeus, on the tenth day of the same lunar month in the month of Xanthicus, which is by us called Nisan, on the fourteenth day of the lunar month. III, 10. 1-6; cp. Num. 29. 1-39.

(6) On the first day of the lunar month Xanthicus Miriam the sister of Moses died. IV, 4. 6; cp. Num. 20. 1.

(7) Aaron died on the first day of the lunar month called by the Athenians Hecatombaeon, by the Macedonians Lous, and by the Hebrews Ab. IV, 4. 7; cp. Tal. Taanit 9.

(8) Moses died on the first day of the month, which is called by the Macedonians Dystrus, but by us Adar, IV, 8. 49; cp. Tal. Kiddushin 38, where the tradition of Moses' death is given as having taken place on the seventh of Adar.

(9) In the second month which the Macedonians call

Artemisius, and the Hebrews Iyyar, Solomon began to build the Temple. VIII, 3. 1; cp. 1 Kings 6. 1.

(10) In the seventh month which is called by our countrymen Tishri, but by the Macedonians Hyperberetaeus, the Jews assembled together to remove the ark of God to the Temple. VIII, 4. 1; cp. 1 Kings 8. 2.

(11) On the twenty-third day of the twelfth month, which is called by us Adar, but by the Macedonians Dystrus, the second temple was built. XI, 4. 7; cp. Ezra 6. 15; see also below, chap. VIII.

(12) On the feast of unleavened bread, in the first month, which is called according to the Macedonians Xanthicus, but according to us Nisan, all the people celebrated the festival, having purified themselves, according to the law of their country. XI, 4. 8; cp. Ezra 6. 19-22.

(13) All the Jews of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin came together according to the decision of the Elders, on the twentieth day of the ninth month, which according to the Hebrews is called Tebeth [Kislev] and according to the Macedonians Apellaeus. XI, 5. 4; cp. Ezra 10. 9.

(14) In the twelfth month which was called Adar, Artaxerxes made a wedding feast for Esther. XI, 6. 2.

(15) That the Jews may defend themselves the very same day from unjust violence, namely, on the thirteenth day of the twelfth month, which is Adar (from the letter of Artaxerxes). XI, 6. 12; cp. Esther 8. 12.

(16) On the thirteenth day of the twelfth month, which according to the Hebrews is called Adar, but according to the Macedonians Dystrus, they (the Jews) should destroy their enemies. XI, 6. 13; cp. Esther 9.

(17) They (the Jews) banded themselves together again

on the fourteenth day of the month Dystrus, and slew their enemies. *Ibid.*, cp. above, 16, and Esther 9. 1-18.

(18) In the letter from Antiochus the Great to Ptolemy he said that he granted a discharge from taxes for three years to its present inhabitants, and to such as shall migrate to it (Jerusalem) before the month Hyperberetaeus. XII, 3. 3.

(19) On the twenty-fifth day of the month, which is called Kislev by us and by the Macedonians Apellaeus, Antiochus erected an altar on the top of God's altar. XII, 5. 4 and XII, 7. 6; cp. 1 Macc. 1. 59; 4. 52.

(20) On the twenty-fifth day of the month Kislev, which the Macedonians called Apellaeus, the Jews purified the Temple. XII, 7. 6; cp. 1 Macc. 4.

(21) On the twentieth day of that month, which is called by the Jews Adar, and by the Macedonians Dystrus, the victory over Nicanor took place. XII, 10. 5; cp. 1 Macc. 7. 49 and 2 Macc. 15. 36.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that with one exception¹¹³ all the dates mentioned in the *Antiquities* occur in the first Twelve Books, which are directly based on Hebrew documents and traditions, whereas the sources of *Bell. Iud.* are the contemporary documents of the war-time which were naturally dated according to the Tyrian calendar which prevailed universally in Syria.

¹¹³ This exception is fully explained by the fact that his source was, as he himself states, the letter of Antiochus the Great to Ptolemy, and so there was no occasion for giving the Jewish month. Also in the latter books (XIV), where he gives the decree of the City of Athens, he uses the months mentioned in that document. In the decrees of the Romans, too, he gives Roman months, April, February, and October. Names of months were drawn from his sources. Comp. also *Ant.* VIII, 13, 2.

Furthermore, the same passage in *Bell. Iud.* concerning the death of Vitellius on the third of Apellaeus,¹¹⁴ which is used by Niese to prove that the Roman calendar could not have been employed here as this would conflict with the testimony of Tacitus, who dates his death December 20,¹¹⁵ can be used with equal force to prove that the Hebrew calendar is not in consideration here, for Dec. 20, in 69 C.E. corresponds to Kislev 19–20, and not to the third of Kislev.¹¹⁶

Finally, the strongest proof advanced by Ideler regarding the Hebrew character of the nominally Macedonian months, which is based on the identification of the Wood-Festival on the 14th of Lous with the festival known to the Mishnah as the 15th of Ab, and which has thus far been generally conceded even by those who oppose the general inference drawn from this by Ideler, is open to serious criticism. For, as we shall show presently, this festival is none other than the Wood-Festival of the 10th of Elul, and if our

¹¹⁴ *Bell. Iud.*, IV, 11. 4–654.

¹¹⁵ Tacitus, *Hist.*, III, 79.

¹¹⁶ The third of Apellaeus was in 69 C.E. close to the twentieth of Kislev. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 354, London, 1900, thinks in our texts of *Bell. Iud.* these are scribal errors, and that instead of *τρίτη Ἀπελλαίου* it should read K (20) *Ἀδυναίου*, because, according to Lewin, the calendar used by Josephus in *Bell. Iud.* was the Jewish one, and in 69 C.E. the 20th of December fell about 20th Tebet (Ginzel, *Handbuch*, Tafel IV). As Gumpach observes (*Über den alt. jüd. Kalender*, Tabella I, Leipzig, 1848), this was a leap year. But this year was not a leap year on account of being a sabbatical year (68–69 is a sabbatical year, see above). Those who believe that the Calendar is used in *Bell. Iud.* according to the Jewish months, see errors where they do not exist. Hence, Lewin who claims that for Apellaeus we must substitute Audynaues, as well as those scholars who, because the Mishnah mentions 15th of Ab as a Wood-Festival, are determined on changing the 14th of Lous—mentioned in *Bell. Iud.* as a Wood-Festival—to 15th of Lous, and thus proving Lous = Ab,—all these pervert the chronography of this work of Josephus. See further below, No. XXIII, p. 82.

theory is correct the identification of Lous with Ab must be completely abandoned.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷ It is interesting to note that in *Bell. Iud.* Josephus mentions 15th of Xanthicus (No. 38) and makes no reference to its being Passover. Apparently in this year, 72 c. e., the 15th of Xanthicus did not fall on the 15th of the month Nisan. Masada was captured in 72 c. e., see Nieße, *l. c.*, pp. 211-12; Tillemont, *Histoire*, I, p. 655, and C. Zumpt, *Annales veterum regnorum et populorum imprimis Romanorum*, Berlin, 1892.

CHAPTER VI

THE GREAT REVOLT AGAINST THE ROMANS.

ASSUMING that Josephus employed the Tyrian calendar in his account of the Jewish Revolt, it is still impracticable to identify the dates of Megillat Taanit before we determine the year of the Great Rebellion. The consensus of opinion is that the Revolt began in the year 66 C. E.¹¹⁸ Westberg,¹¹⁹ on the other hand, adopts the year 67, while Jost¹²⁰ maintains that the war began in 65 C. E.

Josephus twice refers to the Revolt as beginning in the twelfth year of Nero : in connexion with Cestius's defeat,¹²¹ and in an earlier passage telling how the rebellion broke out against the Romans and Florus—on the 17th of Artemisius in the twelfth year of Nero's imperialism and in the 17th year of Agrippa.¹²² A critical examination of these two passages shows that the dates cannot be placed in one year. For if the outbreak of the Rebellion occurred in the month of Artemisius of the twelfth year of Nero, then the defeat of Cestius could not have been in the eighth of Dios of the same year of Nero ; for it is known that Nero became emperor on the thirteenth day of October 54 C. E. ;¹²³ and according to no calculation

¹¹⁸ See Schürer, I, 600 ; Graetz, III², 451.

¹¹⁹ Friedrich Westberg, *Zur neutestamentlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig, 1911, pp. 14–16.

¹²⁰ Jost, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II, p. 88 and note 31.

¹²¹ *Bell. Ind.* II, 19, 9 τὰδε μὲν [ταῦτα] οὖν ἐπράχθη Δίου μηνὸς ὀγδόῃ δωδεκάτῃ [ἔτει] τῆς Νέρωνος ἡγεμονίας.

¹²² *Bell. Ind.* II, 14. 4.

¹²³ See Tacitus, *Ann.* XII, 63.

could Artemisius precede Dius in any one year of Nero's reign. For, whether Josephus used the Roman calendar, and Artemisius corresponded to May and Dius to November, or whether he used the Jewish calendar and Artemisius was Iyyar and Dius was Heshvan, or whether his calendar was the Tyrian, Artemisius preceded Dius in the year of Nero's reign. Therefore the revolt must either have begun in Artemisius in the eleventh year of Nero's reign or else the defeat of Cestius occurred not in the twelfth but in the thirteenth year of Nero's reign.¹²⁴

This seemingly insurmountable difficulty is satisfactorily solved by Unger.¹²⁵ According to him Josephus counted Nero's imperium not from the day on which he ascended the throne, but either from the beginning of the calendar year (January 1), or from the day of the Tribunicia Potestas (December 10). This theory finds corroboration elsewhere. Thus the date January 60 C. E. is described as Tribun. Potest. VII Imper. Consu. IV.¹²⁶ Now the reckoning of

¹²⁴ Niese already felt (*Hermes*, 1893, p. 211) this difficulty, and he explained that Josephus counts the year of Nero's reign not from the date of his accession to the throne, but from the first day of Nisan, 55 C. E. Thus Artemisius precedes Dius, and these months of the 12th year of Nero fall in 66 C. E. But Niese hereby contradicts himself, for it is his theory that in the *Bell. Iud.* the calendar of the months is not Jewish but Tyrian (*l. c.*, 202-41). Furthermore, if it be assumed that Josephus employed the Jewish calendrical system in his computation of the years of Nero's reign, then the months of Dius and Artemisius in 66 C. E. would be counted in the 13th year of Nero's reign, not the 12th. For, according to Jewish calculation, the period from the 13th of October, 54 C. E., when Nero ascended the throne, until Nisan 55 C. E., would be reckoned as a full year.

¹²⁵ Unger, 'Zu Josephus', *Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie, Philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl.*, 1896, pp. 383-97.

¹²⁶ See Henzen, 'Eine neue Arvaltafel', *Hermes*, II, 1867, pp. 37-55. Th. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II, p. 755, n. 1. See also Stobbe, 'Die Tribunenjahre der römischen Kaiser', *Philologus*, XXXII, 1873, pp. 23-9.

Nero's imperial reign was dated from the day when he ascended the throne, October 13, 54 C.E., then the date January 60 C.E. could not be described otherwise than Imper. VI. If, however, we assume that Nero's reign was dated from the beginning of the calendar year 54 C.E., or in other words that the first year of his reign ended with the calendar year 54 C.E., and hence January 1, 55 C.E. marked the beginning of the second year, or, likewise, if the years of the reign were calculated according to the Trib. Potest., and hence the first year of his reign ended Trib. Potest. December 10, 54, then January 60 C.E. is properly described Imper. VII.¹²⁷ This is also borne out by most of the coins issued in the fourth consulate of Nero (60 C.E.) whereon we find Tribun. Potest. VII.¹²⁸

According to this theory, the 17th day of Artemisius and the 8th of Dius in the twelfth year of Nero's reign correspond to June 4 and November 25 in the year 65 C.E., and therefore the revolt is to be definitely dated in the year 65 C.E., and not 66 C.E., as is generally assumed, and consequently Vespasian's command in Galilee began not in 67 C.E. but in 66 C.E.¹²⁹ The date 65 C.E. as the year

¹²⁷ See Unger, *l. c.*

¹²⁸ Cohen, XXXII-XXXIX; Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum*, VI, p. 264. Accordingly they calculated the years of Vespasian, not from his ascending the Emperor's throne, which, according to Tacitus and Suetonius, took place July 69 C.E., but from his *tribunicia potestas*; see further, Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, pp. 752-4.

¹²⁹ M. Le Nain de Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, showing that Cappel, too, heeds the view that Josephus counted the years of Nero's reign not from the day of his ascending the throne, but according to the years of his consulate, and hence that the revolt began, not in 66 C.E., but in 65 C.E. As Louis Cappel's book is not generally accessible, I quote Tillemont's excerpt verbatim: 'Joseph dit que la guerre des Juifs commença au mois de May l'an 12 de Neron [s'il conte ces années du 13 Octob. 54 auquel Neron fut déclaré Empereur, c'estoit certainement en 66, mais il

of the revolt fits in also with Josephus's remark that it occurred in the seventeenth year of the reign of Agrippa. For it was after the death of Herod II (of Chalcis),¹³⁰ in the eighth year of Claudius,¹³¹ that is at the close of 48 C. E. or the beginning of 49 C. E., that Claudius decided to give the kingdom to Agrippa, which he did in the following summer.¹³² Josephus, it may be assumed, counted the reign of Agrippa from the 1st of Nisan, as was the custom of Jewish kings¹³³ (בִּאֶחָד בְּנֵיטָן רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה לְמַלְכִּים), Rosh ha-Shanah 1), according to which the interval between the time of his ascending the throne and the New Moon of Nisan, 50 C. E., constituted year one, &c.¹³⁴ so that the seventeenth year of his reign began with Nisan 65 C. E.

That the revolt broke out in 65 is to be seen also from the chronology of the *Seder Olam*, which gives the dynasty of Herod as 103 years (*Seder Olam*, ch. 30): מַלְכוּת בֵּית הֶרֶדוֹס מֵאָה וְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים. The dynasty of Herod dated from the beginning of Herod's rule, early in 37 B. C. E., shortly after the death of Antigonos,¹³⁵ which occurred in January 37 B. C. E.¹³⁶ According to Josephus Herod ruled thirty-

paroist qu'il ne s'attache pas à ce jour] puisque le 8 Novemb. suivant estoit encore selon luy dans la 12^e année de ce Prince. Il conte donc par les consulats, depuis le premier Janvier qui a precedé le 13 Octob. 54 ou qui l'a suivi. Selon le premier, la guerre a commencé en 65 et c'est le sentiment de Luis Cappel dans son abregé de l'histoire des Juifs' (p. 121). Tillemont, *Histoire*, 'Notes sur la Ruine des Juifs', Note XXII, Paris, 1690. See also Scaliger, *Emend. Temp.*, p. 468-70.

¹³⁰ *Bell. Ind.*, II, 12, 1; Tacitus, *Annales*, XII (in the year 49 C. E.).

¹³¹ *Ant.*, XX, 5. 2; cp. Tacitus, *Annales*, XII.

¹³² Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, I, p. 32; Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, 48-9.

¹³³ About his similarly computing the years of Herod, see below.

¹³⁴ See Rosh ha-Shanah 2 b.

¹³⁵ Βασιλεύσας μεθ' ὃ μὲν ἀνείλεν Ἀντίγονον ἑπτὰ τέσσαρα καὶ τριάκοντα, *Ant.* XVII, 8. 1.

¹³⁶ See above.

four years. Herod died at the close of Adar 4 B. C. E.¹³⁷ Now, from 37 B. C. E. to 4 B. C. E. there is only a period of thirty-three years. But doubtless Josephus's chronology for the reign of Herod is based on the Jewish calendar according to which the month of Nisan is the beginning of the regnal year (cp. above). Consequently the New Moon of Nisan 37 B. C. E. marked already the beginning of the second year.¹³⁸ From the beginning of 37 B. C. E. until the close of the summer or autumn of 65 C. E. when the Jews threw off the Roman yoke, and soon after also the yoke of the Herodian house (see further 25, 26, 27, 28), is a period of 103 years.¹³⁹ By this we are to understand chronological years, not complete years—the terminal fraction of a year being accounted a year. The same is borne out by another passage of the *Seder Olam* regarding the wars between the Romans and the Jews. מפולמום של אסורוס (וורוס) עד פולמום (של רומים) של אספסינום פ"ע [ע] שנים אלו בפני הבית מפולמום של אספסינום עד פולמום של קיטוס נ"ב שנים ומפולמום של קיטוס עד מלחמת בן כוזיבא י"ז שנה ומלחמת [מלכות] בן כוזיבא שתי [שלש] שנים ומחצה. From the expedition of Severus (Varus) to the expedition of Vespasian seventy years elapsed, i. e. from the expedition of Varus¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷ See below ; Schürer, I, pp. 415–18.

¹³⁸ According to the Talmud, if a king ascends the throne even in Adar, the time until Nisan is accounted a year, and with that Nisan begins his second year (R. ha-Shanah 3 a).

¹³⁹ In regard to the chronology followed by *Seder Olam* in its total of 103 years for the throne of the Hasmonean house, see below in note 235.

¹⁴⁰ By emending אסוורוס, we get the only intelligible reading, פולמום של וורוס (the expedition of Varius) ; so all scholars read, e. g. F. Westberg, *Zur neutestamentlichen Chronologie*, p. 17 ; Schürer, *Geschichte*, I, 421 ; Derenbourg, *Histoire*, p. 194. G. Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, I, Tübingen, 1860, substitutes אסיונום for אסוורוס, a supposed transliteration of the name of Sabinus who was Augustus's legate in the year when Herod died.

in 4 B.C.E., shortly after the death of Herod, until the expedition of Vespasian, which according to our view took place in the summer of 66, there is chronologically a period of seventy years.¹⁴¹ Similarly, from the expedition of Vespasian, 66 C.E., to the expedition of Quietus, 117 C.E., there elapsed chronologically fifty-two years, i.e. by reckoning the terminal fractions of the years 66 and 117 as full years.¹⁴² Finally, the interval between the expedition

¹⁴¹ In place of 'eighty' there should be 'seventy' years. So Westberg, *l.c.*; Schürer, *l.c.*; Derenbourg, *l.c.*; Volkmar, *l.c.*, p. 84. That in this passage we must emend 80 to 70 we can see from another source. When R. Akiba, at the beginning of Hadrian's reign, started his propaganda for revolution, he demonstrated to the Jews that now was the favourable moment for it, that the Messianic era was approaching, and called Ben Kozeba the Messiah; in this connexion also he expounded the Messianic prophecies of Haggai (2. 6-9), (Sanhedrin 97 b) מעט היא ואני מרעיש את השמים ואת הארץ . . . והרעשתי את כל הגוים ומלאתי את הבית הזה כבוד מלכות ראשונה שבעים שנה ומלכות שנייה חמשים ושתים שנה, i.e. the first kingdom or domination of the Romans, extending from the expedition of Varus (4 B.C.) until the close of the year of 65 C.E., when they threw off the Roman yoke, is a period of seventy chronological years (though in this period kings of Herodian family maintained royal state, and in a slight degree royal prerogative, possessing hardly a semblance of power,—their main object being to please the Romans, upon whose favour their position depended). The second period of foreign domination evidently was from the destruction of the Temple, 70 C.E., until the time when R. Akiba aroused the people to revolt against the Romans (and this was in the year 121 C.E.). But after these two periods of foreign domination—continues R. Akiba in his exposition—'I shall shake all the nations and the House shall be filled with glory', i.e. the Messiah shall come. Rashi did not understand this comment of R. Akiba as referring to his own times, hence he was forced to give a far-fetched explanation. But see Hiddushe Aggadot of R. Samuel Eliezer Edels (Maharsha) on this.

¹⁴² This shows clearly that the insurrection at the close of Trajan's reign included Judea as well as the Diaspora, though Renan, *Les Évang.*, p. 509, expresses his opinion that in these disturbances the Jews of Palestine took

of Quietus, 117 C.E., and the war of Ben Cozeba (Bar Cocheba), 132 C.E., was chronologically sixteen years. By similar calculation the war of Bar Cocheba continued into the spring of 135 C.E.¹⁴³ and lasted altogether three and a half years.

no part. Why did Trajan take Quietus, his best general, from the most hotly contested war and send him to a peaceful spot? Evidently the insurrection had spread so as to embrace the Holy Land, its residents being affected thereby. This is called פולמוס של קיטוס, the expedition of Quietus. See H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II, p. 562; Graetz, *Geschichte*, IV, p. 406; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1857. Graetz, *ibid.*, finds a difficulty in the chronology of the *Seder Olam* referring to these expeditions. He erringly identifies Polemos shel Aspasianos with the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. (for his understanding of the passage the traditional date 68 C.E. suited better), for his chronological computation produced neither seventy nor eighty years from the Polemos of Varus (or as he considered it of Herod) to the Polemos of Vespasian, nor did it result in fifty-two years from the Polemos of Vespasian to the Polemos of Quietus in 117 C.E. But when we regard Polemos shel Aspasianos as Vespasian's invasion of Galilee in 66 C.E., the chronology adjusts itself admirably.

¹⁴³ See Schürer, I, pp. 668-70.